

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
SAVANNAH DIVISION**

JARRETT D. MYERS,

Plaintiff,

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 4:21-cv-278

v.

TREVOR A. KING,

Defendant.

O R D E R

Plaintiff, who is currently housed at Chatham County Detention Center in Savannah, Georgia, submitted a Complaint in the above captioned action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Defendant, who apparently serves as an Assistant Public Defender in Chatham County and, in that capacity, represents Plaintiff in criminal prosecutions pending in Chatham County Superior Court. (Doc. 1.) The Court has conducted the requisite frivolity review of Plaintiff's Complaint. For the reasons set forth below, the Court finds that Plaintiff's claims are frivolous, and the Court **DISMISSES** Plaintiff's action in its entirety for failure to state a claim. In addition, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*.

BACKGROUND¹

In his Complaint, Plaintiff contends that he has been contacting Defendant to no avail for several weeks. (*Id.* at p. 6.) He claims he has requested numerous materials from Defendant including medical records so that Plaintiff can file a medical malpractice lawsuit against a hospital. (*Id.*) He also claims that he needs Defendant's assistance in order to defend against his

¹ The below recited facts are taken from Plaintiff's Complaint and are accepted as true, as they must be at this stage.

pending criminal charges as well as pursue civil lawsuits. (Id.) He also generally alleges that Defendant has not taken actions in his criminal case to be certain that his speedy trial rights are not violated, and that Defendant has not followed up on allegations of abuse Plaintiff has made at the Chatham County Detention Center. (Id. at pp. 7—8.) Plaintiff asks that this Court appoint an attorney to represent him in the state criminal cases. (Id. at p. 9.)

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Plaintiff seeks to bring this action *in forma pauperis* under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1), the Court may authorize the filing of a civil lawsuit without the prepayment of fees if the plaintiff submits an affidavit that includes a statement of all of his assets and shows an inability to pay the filing fee and also includes a statement of the nature of the action which shows that he is entitled to redress. Even if the plaintiff proves indigence, the Court must dismiss the action if it is frivolous or malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)—(ii). Additionally, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the Court must review a complaint in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity. Upon such screening, the Court must dismiss a complaint, or any portion thereof, that is frivolous or malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted or which seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b).

When reviewing a Complaint on an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the Court is guided by the instructions for pleading contained in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 8 (“A pleading that states a claim for relief must contain [among other things] . . . a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 10 (requiring that claims be set forth in numbered paragraphs, each limited to a single set of circumstances). Further, a claim is frivolous under Section 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) “if it is ‘without

arguable merit either in law or fact.”” Napier v. Preslicka, 314 F.3d 528, 531 (11th Cir. 2002) (quoting Bilal v. Driver, 251 F.3d 1346, 1349 (11th Cir. 2001)).

Whether a complaint fails to state a claim under Section 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) is governed by the same standard applicable to motions to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). Thompson v. Rundle, 393 F. App’x 675, 678 (11th Cir. 2010). Under that standard, this Court must determine whether the complaint contains “sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). A plaintiff must assert “more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not” suffice. Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555. Section 1915 also “accords judges not only the authority to dismiss a claim based on an indisputably meritless legal theory, but also the unusual power to pierce the veil of the complaint’s factual allegations and dismiss those claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless.” Bilal, 251 F.3d at 1349 (quoting Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989)).

In its analysis, the Court will abide by the long-standing principle that the pleadings of unrepresented parties are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys and, therefore, must be liberally construed. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972); Boxer X v. Harris, 437 F.3d 1107, 1110 (11th Cir. 2006) (“Pro se pleadings are held to a less stringent standard than pleadings drafted by attorneys.”) (emphasis omitted) (quoting Hughes v. Lott, 350 F.3d 1157, 1160 (11th Cir. 2003)). However, Plaintiff’s unrepresented status will not excuse mistakes regarding procedural rules. McNeil v. United States, 508 U.S. 106, 113 (1993) (“We have never suggested that procedural rules in ordinary civil litigation should be interpreted so as to excuse mistakes by those who proceed without counsel.”).

DISCUSSION

I. Dismissal for Failure to State a Claim.

To state a claim for relief under Section 1983, a plaintiff must satisfy two elements. First, a plaintiff must allege that an act or omission deprived him “of some right, privilege, or immunity secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States.” Hale v. Tallapoosa Cty., 50 F.3d 1579, 1582 (11th Cir. 1995). Second, a plaintiff must allege that the act or omission was committed by “a person acting under color of state law.” Id.

As to the first element, Plaintiff does not state what right, privilege, or immunity Defendant has allegedly deprived Plaintiff of. Plaintiff’s claims are simply too conclusory to plausibly infer that Defendant has violated Plaintiff’s right to counsel secured by the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution or Plaintiff’s right of access to the courts. Moreover, Plaintiff fails to meet the second element of a Section 1983 claim because private attorneys and public defenders “are not state actors for purposes of § 1983.” Rolle v. Glenn, 712 F. App’x 897, 899 (11th Cir. 2017) (per curiam) (citing Polk Cnty. v. Dodson, 454 U.S. 312, 325 (1981)).

For these reasons, the Court **DISMISSES** Plaintiff’s claims in this action in their entirety.

II. Younger Abstention Doctrine

Through his Complaint, Plaintiff is asking this Court to intervene in the state case’s ongoing proceedings and to appoint counsel to represent him against pending state charges. Even if Plaintiff had stated a plausible claim for such relief, which he has not, the Court would abstain from entertaining it pursuant to the Younger abstention doctrine. The question of whether a federal court should abstain from interfering with a state judicial proceeding under the principle of Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37 (1971), must be considered in three parts: “first, do

[the proceedings] constitute an ongoing state judicial proceeding; second, do the proceedings implicate important state interests; and third, is there an adequate opportunity in the state proceedings to raise constitutional challenges.” 31 Foster Children v. Bush, 329 F.3d 1255, 1274 (11th Cir. 2003). While Younger involved a federal suit for injunctive relief of the ongoing state proceedings, the Eleventh Circuit has also indicated that the Younger abstention extends to cases involving Section 1983 claims for monetary damages. See Doby v. Strength, 758 F.2d 1405, 1405–06 (11th Cir. 1985) (requiring Younger abstention where plaintiff raised Fourth Amendment Section 1983 damages claims related to ongoing state criminal proceedings); see also Kowalski v. Tesmer, 543 U.S. 125, 133 (2004) (intervention in ongoing state court proceedings is not appropriate as a Section 1983 cause of action when there is ample opportunity to raise constitutional challenges in those state court proceedings).

Here, all three Younger factors weigh heavily against intervention. First, Plaintiff’s state indictment is apparently ongoing, and any ruling by this Court as to the constitutionality of Plaintiff’s representation (not to mention his request that the Court appoint counsel to represent him in state court) would substantially interfere with the state court proceeding. Second, the state proceeding implicates an important state interest in prosecuting criminal offenses. Absent “extraordinary circumstances,” federal courts should not intervene in state criminal prosecutions. Younger, 401 U.S. at 45. Moreover, Plaintiff cannot demonstrate a lack of adequate remedy in the state proceeding because he is free to raise his claims of ineffective assistance of counsel in his state criminal proceedings. See Boyd v. Georgia, No. CV 112-042, 2012 WL 2862157, at *2 (S.D. Ga. May 14, 2012) *report and recommendation adopted* No. CV 112-042, 2012 WL 2862123 (S.D. Ga. July 11, 2012), *aff’d*, 512 F. App’x 915 (11th Cir. 2013) (concluding that plaintiff had an adequate remedy at law with respect to constitutional claims that he could bring

in his pending state criminal case). In addition, Plaintiff's allegations provide no indication of irreparable injury, and the hardships associated with having to defend against a criminal prosecution do not establish it as a matter of law. Younger, 401 U.S. at 47 ("Certain types of injury, in particular, the cost, anxiety, and inconvenience of having to defend against a single criminal prosecution, could not by themselves be considered 'irreparable' in the special legal sense of that term.").

For these alternative reasons, even if Plaintiff had stated a plausible claim for relief, the Court would **DISMISS** Plaintiff's claims in their entirety without prejudice.

III. Heck v. Humphrey and Rooker-Feldman

Additionally, there is no indication that Plaintiff has been convicted of the state charges, much less whether that conviction has been reversed, expunged, invalidated, called into question by a federal court's issuance of a writ of habeas corpus, or otherwise overturned. To the extent he has been convicted, this Court is precluded from reviewing his claims by the decision in Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477 (1994).

In Heck, a state prisoner filed a Section 1983 damages action against the prosecutors and investigator in his criminal case for their actions which resulted in his conviction. The Supreme Court analogized the plaintiff's claim to a common-law cause of action for malicious prosecution, which requires as an element of the claim that the prior criminal proceeding be terminated in favor of the accused. 512 U.S. at 484. The Supreme Court reasoned:

We think the hoary principle that civil tort actions are not appropriate vehicles for challenging the validity of outstanding criminal judgments applies to § 1983 damages actions that necessarily require the plaintiff to prove the unlawfulness of his conviction or confinement, just as it has always applied to actions for malicious prosecution (footnote omitted).

We hold that, in order to recover damages for allegedly unconstitutional conviction or imprisonment, or for other harm caused by actions whose

unlawfulness would render a conviction or sentence invalid, (footnote omitted), a § 1983 plaintiff must prove that the conviction or sentence has been reversed on direct appeal, expunged by executive order, declared invalid by a state tribunal authorized to make such determination, or called into question by a federal court's issuance of a writ of habeas corpus, 28 U.S.C. § 2254. A claim for damages bearing that relationship to a conviction or sentence that has not been so invalidated is not cognizable under § 1983. Thus, when a state prisoner seeks damages in a § 1983 suit, the district court must consider whether a judgment in favor of the plaintiff would necessarily imply the invalidity of his conviction or sentence; if it would, the complaint must be dismissed unless the plaintiff can demonstrate that the conviction or sentence has already been invalidated.

Id. at 486–87 (emphasis added).

Under Heck, a plaintiff who is attempting “to recover damages for allegedly unconstitutional conviction or imprisonment, or for other harm caused by actions whose unlawfulness would render a conviction or sentence invalid,” must make a showing that his conviction, sentence, or other criminal judgment was reversed, expunged, declared invalid by an appropriate state tribunal, or called into question in a federal court’s issuance of a writ of habeas corpus. Id. If a plaintiff fails to make this showing, then he cannot bring an action under Section 1983. Id. at 489. Furthermore, to the extent a plaintiff contends that a favorable ruling on his claims would not invalidate his conviction, sentence, confinement, or other criminal judgment, the burden is on the plaintiff to prove this contention in order for his claims to proceed. Id. at 487. Although Heck involved a claim brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for money damages, Heck’s holding has been extended to claims seeking declaratory or injunctive relief as well as money damages. See Wilkinson v. Dotson, 544 U.S. 74, 81–82 (2005); Abella v. Rubino, 63 F.3d 1063, 1066 (11th Cir. 1995); see also Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 500 (1973) (“[W]e hold today that when a state prisoner is challenging the very fact or duration of his physical imprisonment, and the relief he seeks is a determination that he is entitled to immediate

release or a speedier release from that imprisonment, his sole federal remedy is a writ of habeas corpus.”).

“Under this standard, it is not unusual for a § 1983 claim to be dismissed for failure to satisfy Heck’s favorable termination requirement.” Desravines v. Fla. Dep’t of Fin. Servs., No. 6:11-CV-235-ORL-22, 2011 WL 2292180, at *3 (M.D. Fla. May 23, 2011) *report and recommendation adopted by*, No. 6:11-CV-235-ORL-22, 2011 WL 2222170 (M.D. Fla. June 8, 2011) (citing Gray v. Kinsey, No. 3:09-cv-324/LC/MD, 2009 WL 2634205, at *9 (N.D. Fla. Aug. 25, 2009) (finding plaintiff’s claims barred by Heck’s favorable termination requirement where plaintiff sought invalidation of his traffic conviction but failed to appeal the conviction in state court)); Domotor v. Wernet, 630 F. Supp.2d 1368, 1379 (S.D. Fla. 2009) (“allowing the plaintiff to circumvent applicable state procedures and collaterally attack her convictions in federal court is the precise situation that Heck seeks to preclude” because Plaintiff entered into a plea agreement with knowledge of substantially all of the allegations that now form the basis of a § 1983 action for damages); St. Germain v. Isenhower, 98 F. Supp.2d 1366, 1372 (S.D. Fla. 2000) (holding plaintiff’s convictions for the lesser-included offenses of false imprisonment and misdemeanor battery did not constitute a favorable termination and thus plaintiff’s § 1983 action was precluded by Heck)); see also Cooper v. Georgia, No. CV413-091, 2013 WL 2253214, at *2 (S.D. Ga. May 22, 2013) *report and recommendation adopted by*, No. CV413-091, 2013 WL 2660046 (S.D. Ga. June 11, 2013); Brown v. Renfroe, No. CV210-003, 2011 WL 902197, at *2 (S.D. Ga. Jan. 25, 2011), *report and recommendation adopted by*, No. CV210-003, 2011 WL 892359 (S.D. Ga. Mar. 9, 2011), *aff’d sub nom.*, Brown v. Coleman, 439 F. App’x 794 (11th Cir. 2011).

In this case, Plaintiff has not shown that his conviction or sentence has been favorably terminated. Quite the contrary, Plaintiff's chief complaint is that his right to counsel is being violated in the ongoing case. Furthermore, a plaintiff's claim that his attorney is forcing him to plead guilty "goes 'to the fundamental legality' of his conviction and is barred by Heck until the plaintiff shows that his conviction has been invalidated." Lockett v. Wright, No. CV 112-150 (S.D. Ga. Jan. 15, 2013); see also, Salas v. Pierce, 297 Fed. App'x 874, 876 (11th Cir. 2008) (district court properly found that plaintiff's Section 1983 claim against assistant district attorney for conspiring with his counsel to coerce him into pleading guilty was barred by Heck).

Additional grounds also support dismissal, to the extent Plaintiff wants the Court to review any underlying criminal conviction. Pursuant to the Rooker-Feldman doctrine, the Court is without jurisdiction over Plaintiff's putative claims, which would essentially seek review of a state-court criminal charge against him. "The Rooker-Feldman doctrine derives from Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Company, 263 U.S. 413 (1923), and District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462 (1983), and provides that, as a general matter, federal district courts lack jurisdiction to review a final state court decision." McCorvey v. Weaver, No. 15-10470, 2015 WL 5751756, at *1 (11th Cir. Oct. 2, 2015). "Rooker-Feldman applies because, among the federal courts, Congress authorized only the Supreme Court to reverse or modify a state court decision." Helton v. Ramsay, 566 F. App'x 876, 877 (11th Cir. 2014) (citing Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp., 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005)). Because Plaintiff, through this Section 1983 action, essentially asks this Court to invalidate the proceedings against him in the Chatham County Superior Court, this Court lacks jurisdiction over his claims.

For these additional reasons, the Court **DISMISSES** Plaintiff's claims in their entirety.

IV. Leave to Appeal In Forma Pauperis

The Court also denies Plaintiff leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*.² Though Plaintiff has, of course, not yet filed a notice of appeal, it would be appropriate to address these issues in the Court's order of dismissal. Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3) (trial court may certify that appeal is not taken in good faith "before or after the notice of appeal is filed").

An appeal cannot be taken *in forma pauperis* if the trial court certifies that the appeal is not taken in good faith. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3); Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3). Good faith in this context must be judged by an objective standard. Busch v. Cty. of Volusia, 189 F.R.D. 687, 691 (M.D. Fla. 1999). A party does not proceed in good faith when he seeks to advance a frivolous claim or argument. See Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962). A claim or argument is frivolous when it appears the factual allegations are clearly baseless or the legal theories are indisputably meritless. Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989); Carroll v. Gross, 984 F.2d 392, 393 (11th Cir. 1993). Or, stated another way, an *in forma pauperis* action is frivolous and, thus, not brought in good faith, if it is "without arguable merit either in law or fact." Napier v. Preslicka, 314 F.3d 528, 531 (11th Cir. 2002); see also Brown v. United States, Nos. 407CV085, 403CR001, 2009 WL 307872, at *1–2 (S.D. Ga. Feb. 9, 2009).

Based on the above analysis of Plaintiff's action, there are no non-frivolous issues to raise on appeal, and an appeal would not be taken in good faith. Thus, the Court **DENIES** *in forma pauperis* status on appeal.

² A certificate of appealability is not required in this Section 1983 action.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the Court **DISMISSES** Plaintiff's claims and **DENIES** Plaintiff leave to appeal in forma pauperis. The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk of Court to enter the appropriate judgment of dismissal and to **CLOSE** this case.

SO ORDERED, this 2nd day of June, 2022.



R. STAN BAKER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA